

This week, the Supreme Court ruled on [Arizona's immigration law](#). The court struck down three of the four contested parts of the law. However, the court upheld the central plank in Arizona's law that allows police officers to check the legal status of someone they lawfully stop. In doing so, the decision fundamentally upholds the joint federal-state role on immigration enforcement that Congress intended. Where the justices ruled against Arizona was whether the state could add penalties to illegal immigrants, such as making it a state crime to apply for a job without citizenship.

On whole, I am pleased that the Supreme Court recognized the important role states play in immigration enforcement. The Administration attempted to substitute its own enforcement priorities by maintaining that states cannot enforce federal immigration statutes that the Administration has chosen not to enforce. This logic was misguided and inconsistent with federal laws that explicitly authorize states to assist in immigration enforcement. As a result, I strongly believe the Court was correct in ruling that the Administration cannot further weaken enforcement of our nation's immigration laws by completely handcuffing efforts taken by states.